

ONS000230
PATENT

S.N. 09/805,969

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 and 11-12 remain in the application.

Claims 5 and 8 are amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the inventions.

Claims 17-21 are cancelled by this amendment.

Claims 9-10, 13-16, and 22-23 were previously cancelled.

First 35 USC 112 Rejection;

Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 USC 112 failing to comply with the written description for using the word centralized. This rejection is respectfully traversed. The Office Action states that "A centralized updating system" is not disclosed in the specification. Specifically, the specification shows multiple updating of directories, for example the updating of directories 20 and 46". It is respectfully submitted that this assertion is inaccurate.

First, the specification clearly describes on page 3, lines 5-21, that Graphical User Interfaces provide a means for external systems of record, for example SOR 12, to communicate with directory services 20. Page 4, lines 7-11 states "Directory services 20 provides, among other features, a central directory 46, containing all pertinent data associated with a database object, an employee object for example, which is common to SOR's 12-18" Thus, central directory 46 is contained within directory services 20. It should be noted that a directory service may include other things in addition to a directory, thus, updating directory 46 also updates a portion of directory services 20. Further, page 6, lines 5-6 further clarify that the updating function is a portion of directory services 20. Additionally, page 18, lines 28-31, clearly state that "By now it should be appreciated that a synergistic information management system has been presented which substantially facilitates directory data manipulation between a centralized directory service and the

ONS000230
PATENT

S.N. 09/805,969

SOR's coupled to the centralized directory service." Thus, directory services 20 is clearly "centralized" and the updating function is a portion of the centralized directory services and therefore must also be centralized.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the assertion in the Office Action is inaccurate and should be withdrawn.

Second 35 USC 112 Rejection:

Claims 4-7 and 17-21 were rejected under 35 USC 112 for being indefinite because in claim 4 is was not clear where the second list of data objects is provided, because in claim 5 it was not clear how a first, second, and third set of changes are related, and because claim 17 had an antecedent basis error.

Regarding claim 4, claim 4 depends from claim 1. Claim 1 states in line 21 that the central directory is coupled to provide the second list. Thus it is clear to one skilled in the art where the second list is provided.

Regarding claim 5, the claim is not a technical description of how these claims elements are formed are related. The claim must be definite in the words that are used to describe the elements so that the elements can be identified. It is respectfully submitted that is completely unambiguous that the sets of changes exist, it is not required to define how they are related in order to make the claim definite. However, claim 5 continues to provide relational information and states that the second set of changes includes a portion of the first set of changes and that the third set of changes includes a portion of the changes made to the financial data. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that these descriptions are definite. If the Examiner believes them to be indefinite it would be appreciated if the Examiner would please explain how the interpretation of these words can be indefinite.

Claim 17 is now cancelled, thus the rejection thereof is now moot.

ONS000230
PATENT

S.N. 09/805,969

First 35 USC 103 Rejection:

Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over U.S. patent no. 6,233,588 issued to Marchoili et al in view of U.S. patent no. 6,401,079 issued to Kahn et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

First, it should be noted that the Marchoili et al reference is improperly applied to applicant's claims. Claim 1 calls for a centralized updating system external to the first system of record. Claim 1 further calls for the human resources system of record and the financial system of record having access to the data within the central directory.

However, the Marchoili et al system is a distributed system that allows updating of each database that resides at each regional system as described in the abstract that states "Each region operates independently of the master database, and can change (add, modify, or delete) access control information and cardholder information stored in its regional database". Such operation of the Marchoili et al system is supported by the column 6, lines 1-11 that were cited by the Office Action. The Marchoili et al system downloads the complete database to each regional system and the regional system changes each individual regional database. This operation is completely the opposite of the central directory called for by claims 1-4. Claim 1 calls for the system of record to receive only objects of data, not the entire database and make changes to these objects. The centralized updating function then updates the central database as a result of the changes in the data objects. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Marchoili et al teaches against applicants' claim 1 and can not teach or suggest applicants' claims 1-4. Thus, the use of the Marchoili et al reference is improper and rejections thereunder should be withdrawn.

It should be noted that this description of Marchoili et al was explained in the response to the previous Final Rejection.

ONS000230
PATENT

S.N. 09/805,969

Further, claim 1 calls for, among other things, a security system ... wherein the second database is updated from the first database at the predetermined intervals. The Marchoili et al reference states in column 5, lines 41-61 that system 26 may act as a security system, but, system 26 downloads data to the central system 16. This is the opposite of claim 1 that calls for the security system to be updated from the first database of the central directory. Consequently, at least this step is not taught or suggested by Marchoili et al. The addition of the Kahn et al reference does not make-up for this deficiency of Marchoili et al. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the combined relied on references are deficient in making obvious claim 1.

Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Additionally, claim 4 calls for, among other things, the centralized directory having a second directory server to maintain redundant sets of the first list of data objects. The combined relied on references do not teach or suggest the centralized directory having a first database and a second database of redundant sets. The Office Action states that Marchoili has a second directory server (Server 16), however, claim 4 calls for the second directory server to be a part of the central directory. Such a second directory server is not taught or suggested by the combined relied on references. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 4 is not made obvious by the combined relied on references.

Second 35 USC 103 rejection:

Claims 5-9 and 11-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over U.S. patent no. 6,233,588 issued to Marchoili et al. in view of U.S. patent no. 5,706,509 issued to Tso. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

ONS000230
PATENT

S.N. 09/805,969

Applicants' amended claim 5 includes, among other features, a human resources system of record external to the central directory and external to the security system wherein the human resources system of record has access to **modify employee data within the central directory**; and a financial system of record external to the central directory, external to the human resources system of record, and external to the security system wherein the financial system of record has access to modify financial data **within the central directory** including employee asset data.

The combined relied on references are silent on a human resources system of record and a financial system of record having access to modify the data **within the central directory**. As explained in the traversal of the rejection of claim 1, Marchoilli et al teach against this limitation of claim 5 by teaching that the entire database is downloaded to other systems and then information in the other systems are modified. Thus the combined relied on references can not teach or suggest at least this step of claim 5.

Claims 6 and 7 depend from claim 5 and are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 5.

Amended claim 8 includes, among other elements, providing a financial system of record external to the central directory wherein the financial system of record has access to modify the financial information **within the central directory** and access to the employee asset information, and providing a human resources system of record external to the central directory and external to the human resources system of record wherein the human resources system of record has access to modify the employee information **within the central directory**. At least this combination of elements is not taught or suggested by the combined references. AS stated hereinbefore in the traversal of the rejection of claim 5, the combined relied on references teach

ONS000230
PATENT

S.N. 09/805,969

against these steps by teaching that the entire database is downloaded to the regional computers. Claim 8 calls for the financial or human resources system of record to modify the data that is within the central database not data in another (regional) database. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the combined relied on references do not make amended claim 8 obvious.

Claims 11 and 12 depend from claim 8 and are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 8.

Third 35 USC 103 Rejection:

Claims 17-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over U.S. patent no. 6,401,079 issued to Kahn et al in view of U.S. patent no. 6,233,588 issued to Marchoili et al. Since claims 17-21 are cancelled, the rejection thereof in is now moot.

ONS000230
PATENT

S.N. 09/805,969

CONCLUSION

Applicants made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. In view of all of the above, it is believed that applicants' claims are allowable, and that the case is now in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Although it is believed that no fees are due for this amendment, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 50-1086.

If there are matters which can be discussed by telephone to further the prosecution of this Application, Applicants invite the Examiner to call the undersigned attorney/agent at the Examiner's convenience.

Respectfully submitted,
William Ender et al, by

Robert F. Hightower

ON Semiconductor
Law Dept./MD A700
P.O. Box 62890
Phoenix, AZ 85082-2890

Robert F. Hightower
Attorney for Applicants

Reg. No. 36163
Tel. (602) 244-5603